



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/774,368 | 02/10/2004 | David A. Pensak | 21016-00002 | 9526 |

28534 7590 11/13/2007
MIRICK, O'CONNELL, DEMALLIE & LOUGEE, LLP
1700 WEST PARK DRIVE
WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

STEELMAN, MARY J

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2191

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

11/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/774,368

Applicant(s)

PENSAK ET AL.

Examiner

MARY STEELMAN

Art Unit

2191

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MARY STEELMAN.

(3) Douglas Merrell, Applicant.

(2) Brian Dingman, Reg. No. 32,729.

(4) Kathry Chelini, Reg. No. 52,723.

Date of Interview: 29 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, 8 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Horning et al. US Patent App Pub 2005 / 0204348 A1.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

MARY STEELMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of invention: Execution controller, including operating system API calls, is embedded in an application computer program. One or more bytes of subsection of application computer program are relocated and operating system interrupt calls are inserted in place of the relocated bytes. Application computer program is launched, which in turn launches embedded execution controller. Application executes up to operating system interrupt call, execution controller calls operating system API (to enable / attach an operating system debugger interface)(at this point some functionality such as authenticating, authorizing, encrypting, decrypting, re-encrypting, tamper detecting occurs), the bytes of subsection of application computer program are restored, program counter is reset to execute restored bytes and resume execution. Applicant may amend claims. Examiner will do further search.